## **EXHIBIT** L

Miller, Craig - Vol. II October 22, 2008 Sacramento, CA

Page 199

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

--000--

IN RE PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRY

AVERAGE WHOLESALE PRICE

LITIGATION

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO MDL No. 1456

State of California, ex rel. Civil Action:

Ven-A-Care v. Abbott 01-12257-PBS

Laboratories, Inc., et al.

--000--

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 22, 2008

--000--

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF

CRAIG MILLER - VOLUME II

--000--

Reported By: INA C. LeBLANC, CSR No. 6713

Henderson Legal Services, Inc.

Miller, Craig - Vol. II

October 22, 2008

Sacramento, CA

Page 316 Page 318 reimbursed for? documents that we went over at your last 2 deposition. These are documents marked Miller 2 A. That's correct. Q. And that URA would -- should in each 3 Exhibit 7 through Miller Exhibit 10. 3 instance reflect one-tenth of AMP? Sorry. I only have one copy of these. 4 4 5 Do you recall seeing these at your last 5 A. Yes. deposition? 6 MR. BENNETT: No more questions. 6 7 7 A. Yes. 8 **EXAMINATION** 8 Q. For the record, these are BY MS. BERWANGER: 9 communications from Geneva Pharmaceuticals, which 9 10 Q. Again, for the record, my name is Lara is the former name of my client, Sandoz Inc., to the State of California, correct? Berwanger. I represent Sandoz Inc. 11 12 Mr. Miller, I believe that you 12 A. Yes. 13 testified earlier today that you had some 13 Q. And I believe you agreed with me at conversations with Kevin Gorospe about whether your last deposition that based on these letters, 14 15 California compared AMP or URA as to any other 15 California received AMPs directly from Geneva Pharmaceuticals from 1992 through 1996; is that pricing information. 16 correct? 17 A. Yes. 17 Q. And from your conversations with him, 18 A. I need to review this to see the dates 18 you determined that California did not compare 19 here. 19 AMPs or URAs to any other pricing information, 20 20 Q. Sure. Take your time. A. 1992, '94, and 1995, 1996 -- yes. correct? 21 21 22 A. Correct. 22 Q. And I believe that at your last Page 317 Page 319 1 Q. Are you familiar with the term AWP? deposition you agreed with Mr. Robben that AMPs 2 were to represent a price generally paid by 2 3 Q. Based on your conversation with Mr. 3 manufacturers to -- I'm sorry. Scratch that. I believe at your last deposition you Gorospe, is it fair to say that California did 4 not compare AMP or URA information to AWP? agreed with Mr. Robben that AMPs represented a 5 6 A. In everything but a training that Kevin price paid by wholesalers to manufacturers for 7 their drugs; is that correct? 7 had done for us where AWP was listed as 100 and 8 AMP, in this example, was listed as 80, and I 8 A. Correct. Q. So if California had compared -just assume that's a generally known percentage 9 9 difference between the two figures. 10 scratch that. 10 Q. So you assume it's generally known that 11 Is it fair to say, based on your 11 AWP is higher than AMP? conversation with Kevin Gorospe, that California 12 12 13 A. Yes. 13 never compared Sandoz AMPs that FDB published -that First Data Bank published for Sandoz during Q. And aside from that training material 14 14 that I believe was an exhibit to your last the period 1992 to 1996? 15 15 deposition --A. Yeah. I so stated. 16 16 17 A. Yes. 17 Q. And is it fair to say that if California had compared the AMPs for Sandoz Q. -- to your knowledge, there have been 18 18 no other calculations or comparisons done between 19 products from 1992 to 1996 to the AWPs reported 19 AMPs or URAs and AWP? 20 in First Data Bank for Sandoz, that it would have 20 A. Correct. 21 found that the AWPs were higher than the AMPs? 21 22 Q. I'm going to put in front of you some A. I've been told that the AWPs should be

31 (Pages 316 to 319)